

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007.

Claims 1-45 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-45. The present Response amends claims 1, 16, and 30; cancels claim 2, 17, 31, and 45; and adds new claims 46-49, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 3-16, 18-30, 32-44, and 46-49. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Specification

Claims 30-44 are objected on the bases that the disclosure fails to adequately disclose as to what constitutes the claimed machine readable medium.

Claim 30 is amended to further limit to “machine readable storage medium,” hence is adequately supported by the disclosure.

B. Claim objection

Claims 30 and 45 are objected to because of the following informalities. Each claim should begin with a capital letter and ends with a period (see MPEP 608.01(m) Form of Claims [R-3]). Claims 30 and 45 do not end with a “period”.

Claims 30 and 45 informalities have been corrected.

C. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 USC § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 45 is canceled.

D. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-42, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anuff et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628.

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to include additional step of “*generating the control tree from a factory based on the request*” and further define the step of “*advancing the control tree through at least one lifecycle stage based on the request, wherein the set of controls in the control tree operates to interact with each other and produce response based on the request in the at least one lifecycle stage.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that a control tree is one specific way to represent the GUI or alternatively all the relevant back end processing components/objects implementing the requested GUI as disclosed in the specification. Therefore, a control tree is not and cannot be anticipated by the GUI it represented, because the representation of one or a group of objects is fundamentally different from the object or objects being represented.

Similarly, the servers 12a-12n in Anuff et al. are the creator or implementer of GUI not the “factory” to generate control tree, which is a representation of GUI.

In addition, a lifecycle stage that involves a control or control tree such as “init” that allows a control to perform initialization is also fundamentally different from a constructor in OOP that instantiates a real object.

Hence, Anuff, et al. fails to anticipate the present invention. Therefore, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Subsequently, dependent claims 3-13 and 15 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Furthermore, independent claims 16 and 30 are amended in the same fashion as claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 16 and 30 are both in allowable condition at least for the same reason as stated above. Subsequently, dependent claims 18-27 and 29 which are based on allowable independent claim 16; and dependent claims 32-42 and 44 which are based on allowable independent claim 30 should all be in allowable condition.

E. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 14, 28, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff.

Here, dependent claim 14 which is based on allowable independent claim 1; dependent claim 28 which is based on allowable independent claim 16; and dependent claim 43 which is based on allowable independent claim 30 should all be in allowable condition.

F. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800